

REMARKS

Claim 17 has been amended to call for functionalized ends having functional groups attached. Nothing of the sort is suggested in any of the cited references.

The suggestion that it is obvious to use open ended nanotubes merely because open ended nanotubes are known fails to make out a *prima facie* rejection. There is no rationale to modify the reference, other than the assertion that it is obvious to make the right choice among more than one possible choice with no possible rationale to select between those choices.

In the absence of any rationale to pick open versus closed nanotubes taught in the prior art, there is no rationale to modify the cited reference to use open ended nanotubes.


Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

The new claim 28 corresponds in some ways to former dependent claim 21, but it is more generic. Namely, it calls for functionalized ends that are different on each nanotube. Nothing of the sort is suggested anywhere in the cited references.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 17, 2006



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation